

A  
**Winding-Sheet**  
FOR  
**Mr. Baxter's Dead:**

OR,  
whom he hath Kill'd and Slain in his *Catholick*  
*union*, sweetly Embalmed, and decently Buried again.

BEING  
**AN APOLOGY**  
FOR

Several Ministers,  
*VIZ.*

*Mr. Cradock, Mr. Vavasor Powel, & Mr. Morgan*  
*and, misrepresented by Mr. Baxter to the World.*

WITH  
**Twelve Queries**

Concerning  
**SEPARATION**  
WHEREIN  
Reverend and Learned Dr. *OWEN*,  
is further Vindicated.

LONDON: Printed for E. Royner. 1685.

THE HISTORY OF THE

MR. BAXTER'S DOCTRINE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

effar  
pse o  
pend  
but  
satisf  
ence,  
Baxter  
protr  
and k  
elom  
the P  
L:  
fous  
fence  
fald  
Baxter  
Que  
The  
fous  
refer  
Que  
yet a  
is for  
fous  
Baxter  
Don  
fous  
is a  
nam



# TO THE READER.

Reader,

**T**Here is no necessity (I conceive) to entertain thee here with any Reasons for the Publishing of these Papers; they themselves will make their own Apology; and (I hope) sufficiently defend their publick Appearance. But why they come abroad no sooner, it may not be amiss; nor can it be unnecessary to give thee this following brief Account. The Author's great loathness to oppose one so very highly esteemed by him, as the Reverend Mr. Baxter is, made him spend some time in deliberating what to do: And some Reasons he had which might (but need not now) be mentioned, to hope that Mr. Baxter would publickly and more satisfactorily have retracted his injurious Reflections upon the Dead in his Double Defence, then he hath done; this took up more time and some Expectation of what Mr. Baxter should further say in Answer to the very Ingenious Vindicator of Dr. Owen, protracted yet more: The Authors distance from the Press, the uneasy Access to it, and Murries and Troubles from lying, perjured, raging, roguing Informers (with whom Mr. Baxter would have us still to hold Communion) have all conspired to delay the Publication of it: But, Sat cito si sat bene.

It will be convenient to let thee know, that the Apologetical Sheet is for several reasons published without any Alteration or notice taken of Mr. Baxter's Double Defence, as it was first intended for the Press. Somewhat (and I hope enough) shall be said in defence of it, and more of the Ministers vindicated by it, in Answer to Mr. Baxter's last Part of his foresaid Book, in the concluding Postscript that follows the Queries; which I rather choose to do, than to change and new mold the Apology. The Queries are new modelled from what they were at first designed, to meet with something in Mr. Baxter's Double Defence; but for Brevities sake the places they refer to are not particularly mentioned, nor his words exactly quoted, neither in those Queries that respect Mr. Baxter's Answer to Dr. Owen, nor his Double Defence; yet any one that reads Mr. Baxter with any care, will easily apprehend their Relation to somewhat he hath writ, where he is not mentioned. And thou mayest likewise know that the Apology and the Queries were just entering into the Press, when Mr. Baxter's Catholick Communion doubly defended (which for Brevities sake I call it's Double Defence) came out of it; but then stopt, in hopes that by it they would be superseded: Yet upon serious and (I hope) impartial Consideration of it, I still judge it a piece of Justice to the injured Memories of those Blessed Souls whose honourable names I have rescued from the Infamy of Mr. Baxter's Reflections to publish the Apology.

logy; and to let go the *Queries* with them, I conceive is not needlest, because they may do good (at least by procuring Satisfaction) and I hope however they will do no harm, nor can it sure offend any, much less be a breach of any Law, humbly to ask *Questions* in order to Conviction, and acquiring of more Knowledge.

If I be charged with too severe and disrespectful Reflections upon Mr. Baxter in the Apology; I answer, (1.) I denyed my self the use of several Expressions (as I thought proper for my purpose) lest they should be so interpreted. (2.) It is but a just Retaliation: Mr. Baxter tramples upon Men no way inferiour in Piety and Learning to himself. 3. Mr. Baxter is alive, and those whom he thus traducteth are dead, and therefore the Provocation he gives is the greater. Should any one so disturb Mr. Baxter's Dust, and so backbite him in his Grave; (if no abler Pen would engage) I would to the utmost vindicate his Name from Aspersion, and that with as much just Satisfaction as here I may be thought to be guilty of, though it's like he may condemn me for my good will. (4.) I have some particular Reason to be somewhat more concerned than ordinary, which there is no necessity now to divulge; only I assure thee, Reader, it is no personal Quarrel nor Grudge against Mr. Baxter. (5.) Whatever looks like an *Invective*, I profess I writ with a great deal of demur, trouble and unwillingness; but yet I thought my self constrained so to vindicate the Dead, who are so vilely impeached against. (6.) Had his Answer to Dr. Owen, or that part of it that I take notice of, been attended with so much Meekness and Charity as his Double Defence is, I should have writ in another Style, tho' I conceive he doth not make sufficient Satisfaction for the defamation of his former Book. (7.) If indeed I have given him any just Cause of Offence, I am heartily sorry, and beg his Pardon.

I designed in the Apology to have animadverted upon Mr. Baxter's discourses in dealing with Dr. Owen, and attempted a further Vindication of this Learned Person from Mr. Baxter's unworthy Reflections, and indeed too feeble Essays to confine him; but I could not do it with any consistency with my designed Brevity; and because an acute and very ingenious Person hath taken up the Cudgels in the Doctor's defence, and I hope his Vindication will be continued by able Hands. And because I reckon the Apology for the Ministers, is one for Dr. Owen likewise; for hereby Mr. Baxter is (I think) disarmed of those ill Effects of Separation which he managed against the Doctor; and the *Queries* (if not well answered) will be a further Vindication of him. For these Reasons there was no need of my engaging any more in that personal Contest. Yet to testify my respect to the Doctor, and (I hope) to the Truth; I shall here add some Animadversions upon some of Mr. Baxter's Answers against the Doctor: But while I am just about it, while writing this Epistle to the Reader, I understand there are several Answers to Mr. Baxter come out since his Catholick Communion doubly defended, was published; and therefore supposing the Doctor is by others sufficiently defended, I shall wave what I intended. And sorry that I am so remote, and so out of the reach of Mercurius Librarius, that I have not late heard of the Publishing of those Answers which, for ought I know (for I have not read any of them) would have rendered somewhat that I have writ needlest, I excuse myself thee and my self any further Trouble.

October, 6.  
1684.



A

# Winding-Sheet

FOR

MR. BAXTER'S  
DEAD, &c.

THE memory of the Dead is so universally sacred, that he must be a meer *Barbarian*, yea somewhat more then so, that will judge him in any necessity of an Apology, that makes one for them; especially when they are unnecessarily and unjustly traduced. To spurn and tumble up and down a Soul-less body, and without great need and reason to speak ill of, and defame the Dead, are to all of the least humanity equally abominable; and consequently to vindicate their Reputation, must needs be very acceptable; to beg pardon therefore here, would be to need one. It is he that stands in need of pardon, that makes such Defences necessary; he that is so bent upon strife and contention, and (to say no worse) so childishly unquiet, that nothing will still him but the ratling noise of dead mens bones. It will be asked, Is any so unworthy? I answer, No less venerable a person then Mr. *Baxter*: This great Reconciler, this man of Love

Love and Union, this Catholick-man, who professeth to do all for peace in the Church Militant, seems so great a Leader in the Wars thereof, that rather than want Combatants, he casts his warlike Glove, his Pen, and Challenge, amongst the Church Triumphant, and brings down thence several to be the objects of his Spleen and Opposition; an Ecclesiastical *Alexander*, that wants another world to conquer; design'd that in the first place, the Reverend Dr. *Owen* should feel the dint of his Pen more keen than the Dart of Death: And lest his Overthrow and Confutation should be too small and inconsiderable a Conquest; come down yet four other Ministers, to add Trophies to his Victory: For he is pleas'd, p. 28. to single out four persons, that in their time were as eminent Ministers as any in *Wales*, to vilifie and bespatter them; some of whom (at least) I hope his Charity will be so favourable, as to think are among the Blessed above, tho' he tramples upon them here below: They are above his Calumny, and will make no Answer, unless when he ascends to them in Heaven: For if there be Repentance there, (as Mr. *Baxter* saith there is) why may not Mr. *Baxter* meet with it as well as others? And why may not he also be brought to it by means of their Reproof, whom he hath here so severely reflected upon, and so unjustly calumniated? But though they are silent, and will by no means descend into the lists, nor engage in this *Baxterian* Scuffle; it cannot sure be criminal for one who reverenceth their Memories, to examine whether this Reverend Sir hath not injuriously represented them to the World; that they were so erroneous, so insufficient, and so unfit to Preach; that it had been better Forms of Prayer and Homilies should be read, than they be employ'd in the Ministry; that is, that they were not fit to preach at all: So hath he represented them.

I shall begin with Mr. *Erbury*, because he seems the most to be excepted against. But before I proceed, I desire it may be observed, that I do not at all undertake, nor in the least design to patronize or defend any real Errours (if any such they held) of these worthy Persons, whom yet (I hope) I shall sufficiently apologize for against Mr. *Baxter's* Detraction; at least, I doubt not but I shall be able to find a Vail of Love and Reason wherewith to cover their Nakedness, to perfume their Names, whom he (having inhumanely dragged out of their Graves) hath made to sink before the World; and to make it appear, that for all his great Cry of Catholick Communion, he wanted in this matter a little Catholick Charity; and that he had no necessity thus contumeliously to expose the Dead to the scorn and con-

temper of the Living. But though I will not espouse their supposed Heterodoxies, yet neither will I think my self obliged upon every occasion to be charging and condemning them, in order to the securing of my self from Censure: That unpleasing work of ripping open the Faults of the Dead, I leave to Mr. *Baxter*, who seems to have a particular gift that way. Mr. *Erbury* then, before he was taken ill of his Whimies, was a good Scholar, of smart Parts, very serious and successful in his Preaching, and very grave and religious in his Life and Practice: This Character those that knew him (I dare say) better than our severe Censor of the Dead, scruple not to give him. A very judicious Person, of a considerable Figure, no way infected with his distemper, told me, *Mr. Erbury's Disease lay in his Head, not in his Heart*; that is, his latter Exorbitances rose rather from the disorder in his Body or Brain, than any corrupt Hereticalness in his Mind; which also were the thoughts of others very well acquainted with Mr. *Erbury*, who have likewise told me, that he retained his love to good People to the last. Mr. *Baxter* cannot but know that Persons that are over-run with a deep and radicated Melancholy, may be sometimes so influenced by a particular *Mania*, as to be guilty of very wild and extravagant Actions; who yet when, and as far as themselves, are very serious Persons. And why might not poor Mr. *Erbury* have been allowed a Grain of some such charitable Supposition, especially by Mr. *Baxter*, who considering his Book concerning his Wife, (not to mention this against Dr. *Owen*) and his old Age, may stand in need of an Allowance of a not very different Nature. That Mr. *Cradock* learn'd Separation of him, I know not, but Mr. *Baxter* (no doubt of it) knows; how he cannot prove it, I fear: And what Printed Writings of Mr. *Cradock's* shew, (as Mr. *Baxter* sayes some do) that Mr. *Erbury* fell so far, that it's hard to discern that he was at all a Christian, I cannot tell: But as for Mr. *Erbury's* own Printed Writings, in which if any should say, that there are too many wild Expressions, that look not unlike the Effusions of a distempered Brain; I confess I cannot deny it: Howbeit upon that very account I can and do entertain favourable thoughts of the Person himself, who (I think) should be the Object of our Pity, not of our censorious Reproach. And indeed, I deem it a piece of Justice to judge more Charitably of him than Mr. *Baxter* doth; because in his Defence of himself at the latter end of his Works, he so explains himself, that he seems to me plainly to disown those more dangerous Opinions he was charged with; and some of those that he doth

doth there acknowledge himself to hold, are but Mr. *Baxters* Notions, wherein he differs from other Divines, and therefore of all Mortals he might ( and one would think should ) have been silent here, and forbore to have trampled upon this dead Divine, and tread those Doctrines into his Teeth, which he retracted and disowned ( if indeed he did ever hold them. ) Would Mr. *Baxter* like to be eternally teized and twitted with, or that the World should be Everlastingly dinn'd with, and forever put in mind of his Common-wealth and Aphorisms ?

But suppose Mr. *Erbury* as guilty as Mr. *Baxter* would have him, and suppose he did never repent nor change his mind; what necessity was there to hale him into the Controversy of Separation ? Hath Mr. *Baxter* prov'd, ( or can he ? ) That his erring in Doctrine was the necessary and proper effect of Separation ? Did he not forsake the separate Churches, and lay down his publick Preaching, when he fell into his Notions ? And might not the Separatists have said, that it was the fruit of his forsaking them, their Principles and Churches ? Do not the *Papists* object *Socinianism* as the effect of the Protestant Separation ? And will they not as soon prove it as Mr. *Baxter* shall, that the Principles of Separation ( which Doctor *Owen* held ) were the cause of Mr. *Erbury's* Error in Doctrine ? Moreover, let Mr. *Erbury* be supposed to be what he is here represented, was he always so ? Was he never useful ? Had he nothing commendable ? A man might have expected from Mr. *Baxters* Charity, that when he hath occasion to mention the Dead, some little notice should be taken of their good qualities, as well as so much of their bad. He tells us, in his *Postscript*, *Distich*, *Cato* taught him when he was a Child; no doubt of it, but he remembers as long ago, another Latine Adage, *De Mortuis nil nisi bonum*, which that it should be by him so inverted, so quite turned back into *De Mortuis nil nisi malum*, and the Dead be forced upon the Stage just like Devils, without ever a jot of good in them, doth not surely become the Charity of the Renowned Mr. *Baxter*. Just so doth he bring in, not only Mr. *Erbury*, but Mr. *Vavasor Powel*, and Mr. *Mary Lloyd*, both whom he in his great Courtship and Breeding, puts in their plain names, without the common little respect of two post Letters, namely Mr. Mr. *Craddock* indeed ( of which I shall proceed to speak in the next place ) finds some esteem and favour of our supercilious Expurgatory Indexer ; he dasheth him here, and blots him there, it is true ; and condemns him all over, blames him, censures him, and all-to-be-calls him, but yet his faults are brought in with a *Nevertheless*

which believe it, is an extraordinary kindness, and for which Mr. *Cradock*; Posterity owe him a great deal of thanks; but what were his faults that made him unfit to preach the Gospel? Why, he was a gross *Antinomian*: Ah heavy charge! An *Antinomian*, and a gross one too! Had he not added the word gross, few would have given any great Credence to the Accusation, or thought much the worse of Mr. *Cradock*, for in the days of

Mr. *Baxter* in his Aphoristical haft for justification, by works writ so full gallop over those that stood in his way, and bespattered so many considerable Divines with *Antinomian*, *Antinomian*; That it was grown a name of Reputation and he was reckoned very Orthodox, that was by Mr. *Baxter* thus mis-denominated; and it is too plain, that this was one ill (I will not say Effect but) consequent of it, that many who were really so, were scarce reported so, because Mr. *Baxter* baptised so many by that Heretical Name, that had a better, and did not indeed deserve that Denomination: But how is he proved to be a gross *Antinomian*? Why, because of somewhat Mr. *Baxter* tells us he held and Printed, but he pretends not to quote any particular place in his Writings, nor his own Word; and it is very plain, that Mr. *Baxter* is no infallible Representer of his Adversaries Opinions, and it is very possible, that through forgetfulness, or somewhat or other, he may mistake or mis-represent the Notions of those he opposeth; But what is the gross *Antinomianism* Mr. *Baxter* chargeth him with? Why, he tells us, That Mr. *Cradock* persuades men not to question their Justification after Conversion, for any Sin whatsoever he shall commit; For my part, though if I do not much mistake my self, I am no kind of Friend to *Antinomianism*, I wish there were no worse, nor no more indiffensible Notions in his Writings than this, though as it may be taken in one (*viz.* the worst) Sense, I cannot but dislike it; yet why may not we, why should we not take the words of the Dead in the most favourable Interpretations, What if he did suppose that ordinarily the Converted do not commit such Sins that break their Peace, and lay waste their Consciences; and if at any time they do, that they always rise by Repentance, and new Acts of Faith in Christ, and so need not question their Justification? But suppose he was *Antinomianish*, (as I fear he was too much) are none that are so, fit to preach, nor to be heard? For if not the one nor the other neither is to be done, what then doth he think of all the Ministers of the Church of England, of whom I Query whether they do not seem to live in publick consenting, and still actually to consent as they have Occasion, and to do it practically, to the vilest sort of *Antinomianism*

*Antinomianism* and *Antigospelism* too, when they openly tell the World, that let a man live how he will, so he be one of the Church of England, (if he destroy not himself and be not Excommunicated) they hope he shall be saved, and he hath the Opinion and the hope of the whole Church to rely upon? And is this practical *Antinomianism* the Effect of Separation in the Church of England-men?

Moreover, is every one that Mr. Baxter judgeth *Antinomian*, made to preach? Was Dr. Owen so? Was Dr. Twiss so? Was Mr. Rutherford so? And was Mr. Baxter himself so, when by Twiss he also was tainted with *Antinomianism*? And was that in him the Effect of Separation? One thing more I will add, that Mr. Cradock and I have been told (by some that had reason to know) about the time of *Antinomianism*, (as Mr. Baxter reckons) was declining from his former way of Separation, and inclining to a larger way like that of the Church of England, or of some Presbyterians, or indeed rather to Mr. Baxter's own way, and was this the cause of *Antinomianism*? I would not be thought by any thing I have said at all; to design the Defence of *Antinomian* Principles, against which I have the greatest aversness, but to cover the weakness of an Eminent man of God, which Mr. Baxter without any Urgency, and to no purpose, but very impertinently (if I do not much mistake) hath endeavoured to discover: If I dilate (as indeed I do) some things in his Writings, I would endeavour as I have reason, and I see any necessity, to deliver men from those things which I judg mistakes, but openly to load his person with an opprobrious name, and brand him for an *Antinomian*, while his Soul is in Heaven, I understand neither the Piety, the Prudence nor the Charity of it, for Mr. Cradock (however despised by Mr. Baxter) was a man of very quick and pregnant natural Parts (which it is true) his many avocations too much kept him from cultivating and improving a man that had a wonderful faculty of coming down and bringing with him the things of God to the meanest of his Auditors; and a man for whose very successful labours; the Mountains of Wales praise Almighty Goodness, who sent many to Heaven, where he himself also (I doubt not) is, and where we leave him out of the reach of Detraction and Calumny, and proceed to consider and take a right view of Mr. Baxters next insufficient Itinerant, Mr. Vavasor Powel against whom (besides the general accusations in which he shares with the rest of his Country-men) the charge is very short, but very great, namely Mr. Vavasor Powel was an *Antinomian*, so without any distinction, without any proof or Argumentation; the Que-



cle is pleased to pronounce him; now though I am one of the unfit-  
 test persons living to Patronize *Antinomianism*, or defend any really  
 chargeable with it; so great an averseness have I to that sort of  
 errors; and though I very much fear that too many Dissenters and  
 Lay-Conformists as well as Lay-Separatists are too much tainted with  
 a more refined kind of *Antinomianism*, or rather *Anti-evangelism*, of ve-  
 ry ill and dangerous consequence, that cannot relish those discourses  
 that put men earnestly and warmly upon Repentance, upon self de-  
 nial, upon Obedience and Reformation; especially when they are  
 followed home, and pursued to their Family and secret Sins, their  
 Beloved and particular iniquities, when they are dealt plainly with,  
 and vigorously driven out of all the Fastnesses of their Lusts and  
 Temptations; all the retreats of their delays, their excuses, their  
 evasions, and when the needless and old fashioned things called Rege-  
 neration and Amendment of life, and are pressed and enforced upon  
 them, from the very necessary, the useful, and the Scriptural Topicks  
 of Divine Threatnings, temporal and eternal, will entertain all this  
 with a disdainful look from above, as being much below their high  
 and lofty Graces, and their more Evangelical Attainments, and with  
 an inconsiderate censure of it's being unsuitable to the Spirit and  
 genius of the Gospel; I wish there were none such, and I wish we  
 may not yet smart and be severely lashed for such pernicious notions,  
 (I am afraid) too much reduced to practice. All this notwithstanding,  
 I humbly conceive Mr. *Powel* was no *Antinomian*, though he is  
 branded for one by this Reverend Person, branded by him without  
 any reason, without any mitigating distinction to allay the heat and  
 sharpness of his charge; Mr. *Baxter* cannot but know much better then  
 I can tell him that there are several sorts of Erreticks (I say not He-  
 reticks) that go under the denomination of *Antinomian*, the most  
 gross, namely the Familistical; the more gross, that hold Justifica-  
 tion from Eternity, &c. and the gross of which sort he would have  
 Mr. *Cradock* be; the fine, among whom Mr. *Powel* (it's like) hath  
 the favour to be reckoned; for he adds not gross here, which (it's  
 probable he would) had he thought he safely might, since it is not  
 likely if he had a greater kindness for Mr. *Powel*, then he had for Mr.  
*Cradock*; and Mr. *Baxter* perhaps will add another sort, which will  
 take in all those that are for Justification by Faith only; or that dis-  
 fer from him about the conditionality of Works in Justification, and  
 whether he designed Mr. *Powel* for this rank, we cannot tell, but  
 are left to guess in the dark: However a man would have thought

that one so full of distinction as Mr. *Baxter* is wont to be, and so careful to prevent misunderstanding equivocal words, would have been so just to the memory of Mr. *Powel* (having sufficiently marked him heretofore, and stained his name more then enough in his rencounter with Mr. *Bagshaw*) or at least to his Readers, as to let them know in which of the *Antinomian Classes* he would have them place this Blessed Soul, for I scarce believe he intended we should reckon him as rank an *Antinomian* as Mr. *Cradock*, he that had a distinction ready, the more to expose Mr. *Cradock*, might in charity have found one (instead of a Mantle) to cast over Mr. *Powel*; and that he did not, would tempt one to believe that even the Reconciling Mr. *Baxter* was more set upon wounding with his Pen, then healing with his love and tenderness. But though Mr. *Baxter* hath no good to say of Mr. *Powel*, while he represents him as altogether evil, I will not imitate him in this (tho' in other, many other things I desire it) by hiding what was indeed very commendable in him formerly, when concerned with this same Mr. *Vavasor Powel*: if it prove that Mr. *Baxter* is grown worse in this particular of his Charity, then he was some years ago, I cannot help that, I doubt not but in other things he grows much better.

In the skirmish then between the two *B's* (who had both their stings) I mean Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Bagshaw*, though the former was in much such a paroxysm of an Antiseparating Fever, as of late I conceive he hath been ill of; yet being blamed by Mr. *Bagshaw*, for *disturbing the dust of the dead*, (viz. Mr. *Vavasor Powel*) whom he had jeer'd for false, prophesying; one of his Answers is, that what he writ concerning Mr. *Powel*, was written before ever he heard of his death: *Baxters second admonition to Mr. Edward Bagshaw*, p. 67. 68. But sure he hath heard of his death before this time, why doth he now trample upon him, and turn his dust into dirt and filth? Another Answer he gives is, *That Mr. Bagshaw made it in a manner* (what manner he doth not say) *necessary to convince him by some instance that was new enough for his observation*, p. 68. but in what manner Dr. *Owen* made it necessary for him to name Mr. *Powel* (with the other Welsh Ministers) with so much reproach, unless because *Owen* is a Welsh name, and the Dr. came originally from *Wales*, who besides himself can tell? Or was it because these Separate Souls were near enough the Separate Doctor (being altogether in Heaven) and it was necessary to convince him (in order to the bringing of him to Repentance) by so near instances? He further answers, *That he named not Mr. Vavasor Powel, but only his companion and Fellow-Prisoner*; but here without

any periphrasis or description he names him with the rest of his Country-men: Moreover he adds, *That he did not call him a False Prophet*; but here he doth it plainly enough, tho not *ipsis terminis*, yet as articulately as if he had done so, for he now says in this his Answer to Dr. Owen, p. 28. that *Vavasor Powel* (with his fellow-knights) *so dangerously erred in Doctrine*, and they are certainly worse False Prophets, than by False Prophecies endanger the Souls of their Hearers, then they that only deceive them by some mistake in prognostication. Moreover Mr. Baxter tells Mr. Bagshaw, p. 72. of his second admonition to him, *That he desires to promote, and not to cloud the true honour of Mr. Powels name*, whether of these two he doth here, while he chargeth him with Antinomianism (which he mentions not to Mr. Bagshaw) and takes notice of no worth, of nothing commendable in him; let who will judge. Moreover once again, Mr. Baxter in his Postscript of the aforesaid Book, p. 188, 189. professeth himself sorry, and that it, *viz. The Book*, was a more displeasing work then formerly, because the *Life of Vavasor Powel* was Printed, which had so many good things in it, that he feared least his mentioning his False Prophecies should abate their exemplary use; (and yet he cannot forbear giving him t'other lash in his following Paragraph, about praying for Magistrates; but will not his calling him Antinomian now, abate their exemplary use as much? Are there no good things in his life now, that nothing good is here mentioned of him? And what need had Mr. Baxter again to grieve and displease himself for his late exposing this Exemplary Preacher? For I cannot but conclude he hath somewhat more reason to be troubled now then formerly. Upon the whole, it may (I conceive) by an easy Logick be inferred that either Mr. Baxter is grown worse, or Mr. Powel is so; not this latter, for tho' there be *repenting in heaven*, it is not as yet determined by Mr. Baxter that there is any growing worse there; nor can it be thought that Mr. Powel turned Antinomian since he went to Heaven; and if he had been so before, it is too probable Mr. Bagshaw and the world together should have been told of it; nor indeed doth Mr. Baxter undertake to prove (tho it's true he says it) that Mr. Powel was an Antinomian while he was on Earth, nor will he be able (I hope) to do it, while he is here; and in heaven, (where I doubt not but he will meet Mr. Powel) there will be no need, no allowance of, nor room for villifying and detracting Syllogisms, and to do Mr. Baxter right, he must not be imagined so uncharitable as to think Mr. Powel is not there, for he acknowledgeth, that he was while here

here a *religious, diligent and worthy person*, in his second Admonition, 72. and indeed so he was, and so much so was he, that it lyes not in the power, no not of Mr. *Baxters* Pen to lessen his Reputation, nor at all abate his esteem amongst those that knew him. A man indefatigably industrious, unweariedly laborious in his Studies, and in his ministerial performances; for a long time of great strength of Body, and equal vigour of mind, both which (while out of Prison) he resolutely employed in the Service of God, and very successful endeavours to save the Souls of men; who turned his Prison into an Academy, and proceeded thence an excellent Philosopher, an Expert Physician, and a very accomplished Divine. He preached naturally, and that sometimes with little study (because very frequently) to far better purpose then those Clergy-men that take a whole twelve month to study a Sermon; a greater command of his own and his Auditors Affections, no man not Apostolically qualified could have his Patience, (when called to suffer) was so great that it ran parallel with his sedulous Activity when he was to do; and a larger Commendation of that passive Vertue in any one, cannot vvell be given; if any can (vvhatever it be) that vvhich resided in his Breast, and appeared in all his troubles, abundantly deserves it; less resplendent then vvhich, his Courage could not be, for so prodigious, so not to be parallell'd vvas it, that it may be said vvhithout Hyperbole, that he feared not the face, nor yet the fury of the most menacing, most mighty Mortal; vvhom he did and suffered all things so vvell, that (vvhithout doubt) he is long ago entred into the Joy of his Master, and vvhom therefore vve need no further vindicate. Pass vve therefore to the last *British* Minister, *Morgan Lloyd*, vvhom Mr. *Baxter* is pleased very reprehensively to misrepresent to the World; for vvhom yet there vwill be no need to make any large Apology, since he doth not charge him vvhith any particular error, as he doth the rest; he tells us indeed that he is *known in Print*, but so is Mr. *Baxter* also by his *Aphorisms*, and by his *Common Wealth*, vvhich yet (I hope) is not *sadly destitute of the Spirit*; nor is it *safer good Forms should be read*, then that he should Preach; both vvhich he seems to assert (tho question-vvise) (if vve vwill be so uncharitable as to believe him) concerning these four *Welsh* Ministers altogether. I have been credibly informed by one that then inhabited *Wrexham*, that a Soldier vvhom in great rage and malice thrust down his Sword as far as he could into Mr. *Morgan Lloyd's* Grave, presently fell ill, and in a short time dyed, probably of the Wound he gave or designed to give the Dead Corps of that Blessed Soul; Mr. *Baxters* imployment

here is much the same, only his Pen reacheth much deeper, and  
 much higher too, than his Predecessors Sword, and is like to do much  
 more execution upon his Name, than that did upon his Body; I wish  
 Mr. Baxter a better Office, and a better Pattern; Repentance for  
 his defamation and forgiveness of it too, least too soon the punitive  
 hand of his (I fear) much displeased God overtake, and chasten him  
 for his indecent thrust of his Pen into the Sepulchre of the Dead; for  
 this very Excellent *Minister* did least of all deserve to be thus con-  
 jured up by Mr. Baxter, and made to appear to all his Readers in such  
 an ugly and very frightful vizard; for Mr. Morgan Lloyd (under  
 Mr. Baxters favour) was a Person in whose character we can scarce  
 exceed, by giving either too good or too great a one of him: He was  
 extraordinary for his love to his Country-men, to whose Souls-ser-  
 vice he was entirely devoted, for which he was eminently qualified,  
 being the deepest truest Welsh-man and the most absolute *British Ora-*  
*tor*, perhaps that ever was in the Ministerial Function, and this with-  
 out any hindrance to his *English Fluency* extraordinary for the preg-  
 nancy of his fancy, the tenaciousness of his memory, and the early  
 maturity of his Parts, being but forty when he dyed: Extraordi-  
 nary for his Charity, which was universal, not at all confined to Par-  
 ties and persuasions, for the holiness of his life, diligence in his Stu-  
 dies, unwearied meditation, spiritualizing of all things, and for his  
 very impartial and unprejudiced searches after truth, extraordinary  
 for his humility, meekness, moderation, his great seriousness, and al-  
 ways ready bounty to the poor, which (like the Sun) shone upon  
 the bad as well as the good, and very extraordinary for his strict e-  
 ducation of his Children, for his gravity, which was neither starchy  
 nor supercilious, but real and obliging, whereby he awed all Com-  
 panies he came into; and for a strange and unusual Majesty which he  
 wore in the Pulpit, not forced nor affected, but natural, yet very  
 heavenly and spiritual; in a word, there was no good thing ordinary  
 in him, but all [*Katechoken*] by way of eminency. Such a person was  
 this Mr. Morgan Lloyd, and sure such an one could not be so dange-  
 rous a man as Mr. Baxter traduceth him; no, he was many ways be-  
 neficial to the world, but never prejudiced nor injured it at all, ex-  
 cept in one thing (and that he could not help) which was, that he  
 left it so soon: See and behold (good Reader) Mr. Baxters suffi-  
 cient pernicious Preachers, O wonder (as well thou may'st) what in  
 the world should make so Worthy a Divine, to so little purpose, and  
 so necessarily to defame these Holy Blessed Souls.

\*\*\*\*\*

# QUERIES

## CONCERNING

# SEPARATION

1. Query. **VV** *Hether when one of two Examples (in Divine Worship) is to be followed; either that of Christ (mean, wherein he may be, and (it is granted) should be imitated where the Imitation is not called for by other Customs and Commandments and his Primo-primitive Churches that kept to his Pattern; or that of any other subsequent Church, that either out of its own Head, or out of Affectation or Inclination to resemble some other Church, in Obedience to humane Commands, varies from Christs Example in any stated external Modes of Divine Worship; Whether in this case is it not a Duty to follow Christs Example, and a Sin rather to choose the other?*
2. *Whether we are not at all times to follow the best Example, namely that of our Blessed Lord?*
3. *Whether the Command of any Magistrates, or the Custom of any Church, can take off our Obligation to be Followers of Christ, St. Paul says those Churches that indeed followed Christ, as far as they did him, did so in mean still in things wherein he and they may be followed.*
4. *Whether it is a sinful Separation to leave any Church, as far as it leaves or differs from Christ, or to separate from them in their variance from him? Whether it be not a Duty, and not a Sin, to imitate and follow the Example and Conduct of the Head, rather than that of any differing Member or Members? Whether it be not every Christians Duty to keep close to Christs Example, and those Churches that do so; as if he or they were now in being on Earth, as once they were without taking notice of the different Practices of other Churches?*



And whether they are not guilty of sinful Separation that refuse to do so?

5. *Whether Christ and his Apostles prayed by any Forms not composed by their own Gifts? and, Whether their Gifts of Prayer without Forms, were extraordinary, not to be attained by, nor found in Ministers not extraordinarily inspired?* If so, How come the Ministers of the Church of England to pray by their own Gifts, before or after Sermon? If not so, Are they not alwayes bound to follow Christ's and his Apostles Examples in their way of Praying by the Exercise of their own Gifts? Are they at any time allowed to hide their own Talents in a Napkin, and make use of their Brothers, or yet of their Fathers? If once, why not a second, a third time, and so on, as often as they please? Whether if they sin in the neglect of the Exercise of their Gifts, when they are to pray for, and with, and in the name of the People, and the Prayer is the Peoples Prayer as well as the Ministers, and the People know before hand, that the Omission or neglect is designed and resolved upon, and will be, (if the Form be used) have not they a share in the Guilt as well as he? And the rather have they not, because if the people would not joyn with him in the Form, would not the Minister likely neglect the Form, and use his Gifts, and so prevent the Sins? Are not the People therefore somewhat too much the cause of the Ministers Sin, and doth it not thereby become their own? And if it be said, as it is often by Mr. Baxter, that if we will joyn with no Prayer but a faultless one, we must joyn with none at all, since all Prayers (as well those that are put up by the proper Gifts of the Minister, as those by forms) are faulty: To which I Query, Is there no difference between the fore-known resolved upon, constant stated faults in the settled External Mode or manner of Worship, that may be avoided by another mode or manner, and the unknown (as to particulars) resolved and given against, and accidental Infirmities of Persons in their Worship, that without an exchange of faults, can by noother way be well avoided? Because men cannot pray perfectly, may they therefore pray sinfully? Because a man cannot pray without wandering thoughts, may he therefore be ordered so to pray? Or may he yield to such Orders? Because a Minister may be accidentally guilty of Tautologies in his Prayer by his own Gifts, may he therefore settle them in his Prayers, and resolve for ever to repeat them? Or if he doth so, may he be countenanced in so doing by joyning with him? I much question it, especially if it turn into such a form that I am taken to joyn with all the Parts, Modes, and Expressions of it, when I

joyn with it; or because a man may through Infirmary, and unexpectedly, be guilty of a vain Repetition, may he therefore forever Cry, *Lord have Mercy upon us, Christ have Mercy upon us*, perhaps for no better Reason then that it is so in the Mass? Or may he resolve before-hand to be as duely as he Prays, guilty of such vain and idle Repetitions? Or may he therefore without Scruple, joyn with those Prayers that are stuffed with them? If it be said, that when a man joynes with a Form of Prayer, he joins not with, he approves not of what is bad in it, no more then he doth join with, no more then he approveth of the faults of any conceived Prayer (without a Form) by his presence at it, as it is often by Mr. *Baxter*; I Query, Whether suppose a man do not indeed in his mind approve of the faulty parts of any Form, yet if he do that which seems to be, and hath the scandalous Appearance of an owning and consenting to them, he doth not thereby commit such a Sin that it is by no means safe to live in? Whether Actions do not commonly signify what they are commonly taken to signify as well as Words? And practice and external Actions are not esteemed as plain Intimations of a mans Sense and Mind, as the Discourses and Assertions of his Tongue? And do not men generally take a mans presence joyned with Silence at a Sin, (especially when a man knows of it before-hand, and is a Joint Actor, as in publick Forms of Prayer every man is interpreted to be, unless he equivalently intimates the contrary) to be some consenting to the Sin? And in other Cases do not good Casuists well determine silent presence at a Sin, unless the dislike be expressed by some way equivalent with Speech, to be a partaking of the Evil? And whether it is not better and less offensive for a Dissenter (who in his Conscience judgeth several Actions and stated Modes of Worship in the Lords-day Service sinful,) to absent himself from the Common-Prayer, then by Speech or any other way equally significative, to express his Dislike? Whether the Law-makers Civil and Ecclesiastical, did in the making or do in the Executing the Laws that require Attendance upon the Common-Prayer, design or allow leave to the Attendants, to dislike any parts of the publick Service they are to joyn with? And which parts, or how many, or whether all? If not, Whether it be a scandalous Appearance of owning all to them? And whether Mr. *Baxter* who is so tender of Scandalizing the Magistrates, should be guilty of such a Scandal, and press others to be so too? Whether the Law-makers in the Enacting of those Laws, did only design to bring men to Church, as men bring the ir Dogs with them there, barely to be present

sent? Or whether they did not, and do not design and require such a presence as is expressive of Approbation? Whether if willing designed Absence doth signify *Dissent*, willing designed presence doth not signify *Consent*? Whether if presence doth not signify Approbation of what is bad, it can signify Approbation of what is good in the same Worship? And how it can do so of the one, and not of the other? Whether if presence do not signify consent, a man may not be present at the Mass, or any Idolatrous or sinful Worship in the World? And is not this against the Determination of our Protestant Casuists, as Bishop Hall, and Mr. Baxter himself? And how many stated Sins, and how much of the Mass, or any other sinful Worship ( I mean sinful in the fixed stated external manner of the Worship which may be avoided, not the inward unfixed Frame and Disposition of the Worshipper, which because of the Imperfection ( less ore more ) of all men here, cannot be thoroughly avoided ( which yet sure must not therefore be resolved upon ) may a man joyn with externally, or at least scandalously seem to do so, without Sin? And how much of the Mass must there be in any Worship to make it sinful to joyn in it? Whether a Protestant that understands *Latine* may be present at the Mass? And whether it be a Sin to be present at it in *Latine*, and none to be so when it is in *English*, for him who understands both Languages? Whether all Protestant Schollars may go to Mass, so they keep their consent to themselves, and do no otherwise then by presence joyn with the Worshipping of Angels, Saints and Images, and the professing of Transubstantiation? Whether there is nothing in the Lords-day-Service of the Massevil, besides the last mentioned Particulars? And whether there be something bad in the Mass, which is good ( or at least tollerable ) in the Common-Prayer? Whether a man may have local Communion with any Church in the use of any Sin, except Idolatry? And doth Idolatry only of all Sins make local Separation, or absenting of Persons from Worship, justifiable or lawful? And why presence with Idolatry in Worship, implies consent too, and approbation of it, or is sinful, and presence with other Sins in Worship doth not, and is not so? Whether a man may lawfully kneel with the *Papists* before Images ( reserving his thoughts and intents to himself ) while they are at their publick solemn Worship of them? And whether the presence of a Posture or Gesture doth more signify consent and approbation, then the presence of the Person? Whether every good Christian ought not to resolve to have no local

*Communion with any Church in any Sin, ( i. e. stated Sin of the Worshipper, not the Worshipper ) no more then in Idolatry ? And whether they ought not rather to Worship God in private ( as Mr. Baxter says they ought in the Case of Idolatry ) unless they can have better publick Worship ? And whether they that do so, do separate from the most of the Church, or rather from a Tyrannical Corrupt Sett or Schisme ? And whether even as to them, they do not hold mental Communion with them in Christianity, and in all that is good and sound ?*

Whether God is so fond of Publick Worship, or the Worship of the Multitude, even when a great part (if not the greatest) of them are notorious publick Sinners, of whom we may say without the breach of charity, though not without sorrow, that they make no credible profession of Christianity, as to be more pleased with, and delighted in it ; when (besides the personal infirmities of the Worshippers ) it hath sin settled and stated in it (with which the Worshippers must joyn, or seem to joyn) then with Private Family, or Closet Worship, that hath no sin fixed in it) even when the private Worship is more edifying and beneficial to the Soul, and God's duty is more sanctified by it ? And whether God obligeth men rather to serve him by the former, then by the latter ? Whether he more approveth of a corrupt thing offered by a great number of Sinners, then with a Male out of the Flock of a few ? And Christ will be more with many to do somewhat without his order or leave, then with two or three that gather together in his Name ? And lastly whether Family-Worship was not once the Publick Worship, and whether it should not be reduced to Families again (when the Orderers of the more publick Worship require sinful conditions of Worship) and whether such Family Worship in such a case be not sufficiently publick in the Account of God, and more acceptable to him ? All this I mean, supposing that without fraud, fear or deceit, we indeed cannot meet in a greater number then that of Families, tho in less then that of Churches : If it be said that my Queries concerning joyning with the Sins of Forms by pretence, are as much against joyning with the faults of conceived Prayer by pretence, and it still be urged that the Compliers do no more joyn with the faults of Forms then the Dissenters do with those of conceived Prayers that are not Forms ; To this I further Query.

1. Whether (supposing that we cannot joyn with any publick Prayer (or Worship) without joyning or seeming to joyn with Sin, or with what is sinful (all Worship being faulty) it is not our duty

to joyn with the less sinful, and our Sin to joyn with that which is more so, upon the supposition that we must joyn with one of them? And whether it is not a Sin to joyn with either of them, if indeed we can yield God a better private Worship, wherein we joyn with no Sin, wherein there is none (I mean still in the Worship, not the Worshipers) Whether God doth at any time make it our duty to worship him in a sinful external manner, when we may do it otherwise?

2. Whether that is not a more sinful Worship that hath some Sin established in its matter, or external mode or manner, then that which hath not? Whether it be not a Sin to joyn with the former, rather then the latter. And whether any fears or actual Sufferings should make us take up with the former, or quit the latter, such force excepted, that renders it impossible to maintain and continue in it?

3. Whether there be any better way of managing Publick Prayer, then either that by the gifts of the Minister, or that by Publick Known Forms? And whether the Practice of the Apostles, and the Primitive Christians in their times, should not make us give the Preference to the former, as being less sinful, and more to edification; since the ablest Writers for publick Forms of Prayer (if I do not much mistake) do not pretend to prove that they were ordinarily then in use? Or can it be thought that all Publick Ministers in those times were alwayes infallibly inspired in Publick Prayer; so that they could not be guilty of such mistakes therein, as those who now pray by their own Gifts, are lyable to?

4. Whether there be not these plain differences between joyning in Publick Prayer put by the Gifts of the Minister (appointed by God so to do) supposing it be not a Known Form of his own composing; (which seems to me to be quite another thing from reading or saying a Prayer, composed and imposed upon him, by others) I say whether there be not these evident differences between joyning with the one and the other kind of Publick Prayer; 1. That it seems against reason, and the very light of Nature for any to require or expect (especially in so serious and solemn a thing as Gods Worship) that persons should consent to joyn with any thing before they know what it is, without this condition, *as far as they shall or should approve of it.* And therefore if any should take these persons to joyn with the bad as really as the good, they would not thereby offend against the light of nature, and the scandal is not altogether taken, and not at all given? And whether therefore it is not (or at least should not be) taken for granted by all, that no man joyns with, or consents to

any thing in the conceived (or as it is sometimes I think miscalled) *extemporate* Prayer of another; but what he approves of in it? If it be here argued (as often it hath been) *That therefore Publick Forms are to be preferred before Conceived Prayer, because we know before-hand what we are to joyn with*: To which I Query, Whether at least those that thus argue, and those who approve of this Argument, and those who for this reason, order and command the use of Publick Forms, should not be understood to conclude that those who are present at them, consent to every part of them; unless they sufficiently testify their dislike; and whether they do not give them just scandal by their presence; whether indeed they are more certain before-hand of the Words or Matter they shall joyn with, then those who joyn with Conceived Prayer, offered by those Ministers that have sufficiently evidenced their soundness in Doctrine, and the holiness of their Lives? For may not some Reader through ignorance, carelessness, or willfulness (if he be corrupt in Doctrine, and hath a mind to disseminate his errors) add too, or diminish from the Form? What amends can be made, but what may be in the other case; namely, a reproof or censure according to the nature of the Crime? Whether the practice of the Church in the Apostolical Primitive times, and the examples of the Apostles themselves (who did not generally (if at all) use publick Forms of Prayer) do not, or should not determine the doubt for Conceived Prayer, for was there not as much reason then for the people (the Unbelieving as well as Believing Jews and Gentiles; for of both sorts (no doubt of it) they had Auditors good store) for them I say then to know before-hand, as well as the Lay-people now, what they are to joyn with? And was not a fixed order of Words in Publick Worship as necessary then, as it is now, to prevent the foisting in of errors into the Christian Churches? Then when there were many subtle Philosophers, and many cavilling Jews ready upon all occasions to find fault with the way of the Christians, and jeer at enough, and ridicule too much the religious Phrases, or expressions and there were many such in the discourses, and the Publick Worship, of the Followers of Jesus, that seemed to them unintelligible Nonsense, and insignificant *Jargon*: then when there were many Publick Preachers in the Churches which were not academically educated, and therefore were the more likely to expose themselves: Could not there be thought all of them miraculously inspired in all their Publick Prayer; and when though the Apostles were at some times, and in some things infallibly inspired, yet can it be thought that they were always



to in all their Publick Prayers and Offices? And if this could be supposed, yet can it be meant that the Heathens and Unbelieving Jews did believe them so, before they believed in Christ? And therefore since these Chief, these first and fundamental Ministers, though they were Apostles, though they were extraordinary Officers, and infallibly inspired for Publick Works, and for the use and benefit of the then succeeding Churches, yet since they were not believed so by the incredulous Infidels (though sometimes Hearers) and other ordinary Preachers were not so by the Christians themselves, was there not the same necessity in those times as there is in ours, that Publick Forms should be invented? And who more fit to do it, both for themselves and others, then the infallible and Oracular Apostles.

And let it be further considered, whether the Convenience of knowing before-hand what one is to joyn with, do ballance, or is equivalent with that sudden, unexpected smiting of the Affections, (which are generally the Principles of all considerable changes in the minds and lives of men) that seem more ordinarily to accompany conceived Prayer; which is it not very apparent in the plainly greater Effects which any unexpected, un-fore-known Sermon or Speech hath, then those set Speeches and Homilies whose Words and Sentences are before-known and accustomed to, though sometimes they are more material, more to the purpose, and more Substantial? And in the next place I Query, Whether it can be reasonably expected that the joiners with conceived Prayer should as effectually and publicly express their dissent from what is bad, as they do by presence and silence their consent to what is good? For when should they do it? Before the erroneous Expression is uttered? But how can they know it before they hear it, and the said Sentence is done? Should they when it is over? But then the Minister perhaps is got to a very Orthodox and unexceptionable one; and would it not be to less Edification, and likely to less purpose, to make such a Disturbance and Confusion, then to let the Minister go on in his Prayer? If after all is done, it is like the people will be all going, and will by no means be perswaded to stay to hear what every *Exceptionist* hath to say, and it is very doubtful whether he can remember every Word as it is uttered, and whether he do or no, may it not occasion greater Difference, and greater evil then his open testifying his dislike would do good? But it is much urged, and that frequently by Mr. *Baxter*, that a conceived Prayer is as really a Form to the people, as a Form is one to the Minister.

To which I Query, ( 1. ) Whether if it be a Form to them, it is not

not one of Gods ordering for them? And if it could be proved that Bishops, or Ministers, or the Church, were ordered by God so many years ago, or more lately, to appoint the present Ministers Forms of worship. ( that have Gifts of their own to that purpose ) or that it is Gods will that those who have no publick Gifts fit for the managing of publick Worship, should yet be publick Church Officers, whether most of the Separatists would not soon cease to be so; and submit to Forms which they acknowledge of Gods ordering for them?

( 2. ) Whether by a Form of Prayer in this Controversy, we ought not to understand, such a before-known Order of Words, from which there is no varying? Whether any Minister against Forms of Prayer doth before hand know all the Words which, and just the Order wherein, he shall use them in his intended Prayer, and absolutely resolve upon no Addition nor Diminution? And if it be no Form at all, whether it can be one to the People? And whether the People's not before hand knowing the Words and Order thereof, which they must joyn with in Prayer makes it a Form; since as it is reckoned, the great Property of Forms of publick Prayer Established for common use, is, that all the parts and Order of them are known before-hand?

( 3. ) Whether the publick conceived Prayers of a Pastor over a ny People, ( appointed to be so by God ) made and put up in their names, be not to be reckoned their own Prayers, invented and offered up by their own Gifts, namely the Gifts of their Minister, which God hath made theirs, and requires and accepts of, rather then if they did every one particularly & personally express and put up their prayers for themselves? If so, How few scruple some forms of Prayer that are made up, and presented by the Persons own gifts, especially when they are not absolutely tyed up to such a particular Order of words and matter without any Addition or diminution? How little is this so celebrated an Objection to our purpose? Is not the Minister in Publick worship the mouth of the People? I find this indeed denied down right by some late Divines who have Charitably endeavoured the perswading and proselyting of Lay-Dissenters into Communion: but I Remember the very great and eminent Dr. Joseph Mead, several times asserts it, and I think scarce any ever denied it, except some few of late to serve a turn in defence of forms, and indeed doth it not seem a very certain truth? For if it were not so, would it not follow that the Minister in the Publick Prayers acts as a private Person? And if he doth so there & then when, or where doth he appear in a publick capacity? And where should he rather do it, then in the Publick worship?

Would

Would it not likewise deprive him of half his Work and Office (and consequently of his honour, and *de jure* of his reward too.) For what is or wherein doth lye the main of his Publick Work and Office, unless in Praying and Preaching; the first in the name of the People to God, the second in the name of God to the People? If he represents not the People in the Former, what Publick place doth he bear therein? Besides, do not some Episcopal Divines hold that Preaching is no Ordinance of Christ; and no part of Worship? And can that be part of the Publick Office or Work of a Minister, which Christ hath not Ordained, and which is no part of Worship? And those that consent in, and hold both these opinions, do they leave the Minister any Publick Work at all? And if the Minister be the mouth of his people, and his utterance, intention, and all his Publick Gifts, theirs, (which is implied in the expression) how can their own Prayer, framed by their own publick invention, and uttered by their own Gift of utterance; namely, that which God hath given them for publick use, especially when the Minister doth not stint himself as to words, or the order of them, (though sometimes it may fall out that it is not varied) how (I say) can this be an imposed form upon the people? (4) How can that be a form imposed upon the people that is used by the Minister, by the consent and appointment both of God and the people?

Query 6 *Whether the first Reformers from Rome did well in separating from her in and for Modes and Ceremonies, no more expressly forbidden in the Scriptures then ours (still retained) are?* If they only separated in and for Idolatry, and false Doctrines, why did they forsake, why did they not joyn with their innocent Modes and Ceremonies, commanded by the Magistrates? And do the French Protestants that remain in France, and in the Protestant Faith also, joyn with, and unite with the Papists in, or do they separate from those Popish Modes; Forms and Ceremonies, which we still receive? If the latter; (as I suppose they do) why are they justified, and the former Separatists condemned? How come the first Reformers, and French Protestants to be cleared and admired, and the present Lay-Dissenters to be accused and blamed, since their cases seem so near alike? If it be said, But the Protestants separate from the Papists, for Idolatry and False Doctrines; I Query, and for nothing else? Why do they not then joyn with them as far as they can? or should we not rather more charitably conclude that they indeed go as far as they can?

Query 7. *Is it a hard Controversy with Mr. Baxter, whether he*

*Mr. Baxter's Ans. to Dr. Owens Postscript,*  
p. 14.  
must separate from Papists? And what doth he mean when in answer to an objection, he too plainly intimates that it is more *obscure* whether he should separate from the Papists, then from the *English* Liturgists? I hope through his over hasty zeal against Separation, he hath here misrepresented himself, and that he is not indeed so inclined to joyn with the Papists, as here he seems; but sure he cannot but see how easy it were hence to expose him, but I forbear,

because I doubt not but he hath wronged himself; yet I cannot tell but he may come off with a distinction; though for my part, I know not how. But from what follows in the same page, I would further query, *Whether those that will not go to Mass in Popish Countrys, must be able to prove that at this day all Papists in the world are but about the fourth part of the Christian World; that it was not a few days of our King John, and their Innocent the Third, that a General Council decreed Transubstantiation, that a great part of their own never consented to this, and that few of the people understood or believed it, &c.* And must none but those that can prove all this, refuse to go to Mass? But that I must needs judge better of Mr. Baxter from his other excellent Writings, such an Ignorant am I (though I hope none of the Ph. I. G's) that I should understand him so: I fear by such answers of his, that he was a little graverled with the objection which he there raiseth, and could no better lay.

*Query 8. When is the Sin of a Duty by its evil predominant against the good of duty, so as to make the work rejected of God, and consequently to make it unlawful to joyn with it? VVhen may we know it to be so? VVhether it be not very hard? And whether a man may joyn with any VVorship till he can prove, and knows that the evil is predominant? VVhether the evil must be predominant extensively or intensively, or both ways? VVhether three parts of four, or at least the greatest part of the VVorship must be evil, and whether there is any such VVorship in the world, or at least the Christian; (and I might add the Mahometan) world; or whether the evil must be intensively predominant? VVhether it must be some great sin (and any or many small sins will not do) as Blasphemy, Idolatry, &c? And which and what those great sins are, that being in VVorship, will make it sinful to joyn with it? And why great sins will not less, especially when they are greatened by willfulness, being against knowledge, and constant returning to them in their stated seasons, and continuance in them?*

p. 10. of

Bax. Doub.

Def. f. 9.

then  
evil  
Obj  
of C  
and  
pard  
je  
ferin  
a gre  
Mode  
Mr.  
thing  
and i  
sence  
inven  
they  
worsh  
Prece  
th  
were  
the Co  
Elders  
were r  
if a m  
linely  
tation  
doth so  
tian o  
with a  
he mu  
ther it  
lay dow  
confide  
ly be co  
Q9  
that is  
man is a  
doth, be  
Assemb  
ther som

them? VWhether God may not accept of such VVorship, where the evil is predominant (supposing the three Persons in the Trinity, the Object of the Worship, and it be offered up through and in the name of Christ) from those that are invincibly ignorant, who have been, and are without means and light, whereby to know the evil of it, and pardon the ignorant Offenders; and yet at the same time utterly reject it from those who know the evil, and yet presume to live in offering up their false Fire? Whether washing of hands, *Mat. 15.* was a great evil? VWhether it was more forbidden then the Irregularities, Modes and Cerenonies of some Liturgies and Churches with whom Mr. *Baxter* thinks it no Sin to joyn? Whether the evil of washing of hands was predominant against all the good that the *Jews* did, and intended in and by their Worship? Whether it is not the plain sense of our Saviour, that those who worship God by such fancies and inventions of men (whatever conceits they may have of them) tho' they are recommended by tradition, and commanded by men, they worship God in vain? Whether Mr. *Baxter* can prove that those Precepts of men the Prophet *Isaiah* and our Saviour speaks of, were things feigned to be necessary acts of Obedience to God, (when, as if it were on purpose to prevent any such gloss, it is plainly said, the Commandments of men, and transgress the tradition of the *Anf. to Elders*) and also that it was upon the account only that they *Dr. Owen* were reproved; both which he seems to hold? VWhether *en, p. 13:* if a man lives in any one deliberate Sin knowingly, willingly, and yields to it ordinarily upon the return of the Temptation, this evil is not predominant over his good? VWhether if he doth so in worship, it is not so there too? VWhether every good Christian ought not rather to beware of doing so, then to perplex himself with a multitude of distinctions, and cases, and questions, which yet he must mind, if he will understand Mr. *Baxter* aright; and whether it becomes so truly great and excellent a Casuist as Mr. *Baxter*, to lay down such resolutions of Cases, from which (I fear) too many considerably ill consequences will too fairly follow, and too rationally be concluded.

Q. 9. Whether presence is therefore no signification that we approve all that is done in that Assembly, because the very nature of Christian Communion is a Profession of the contrary? I say not bare presence, as Mr. *Baxter* doth, because there is little bare presence in Religious Assemblies, little presence but what is attended with ei- *p. 10. of Doubt.* ther some kind of Reverence and silence on the one hand, *Def. f. 10.*

or disrespect, and talk on the other, and because there is no question (that I know of) about such a bare presence in a strict sense; but I proceed to query,

Q 10. *Whether it be indeed so as Mr. Baxter argues, a man may not be present at any Christian Worship in the world?* Nay, may I not leave our Christian, and ask whether a man may not be at any VVorship in the world? For is not all Religious Communion, though never so bad, a Profession of the contrary; namely, of owning what is thought good, and disowning what is deemed evil by the VVorshippers? VVhereas because the nature of Christian Communion is a Profession of the contrary, the Papists by their presence, do not own and joyn with the evil of their VVorship? *Whether because we are bound by God to Commune in good, and not to own the evil;* therefore we cannot do so without the evil by Presence? And therefore Presence (without some sufficient sign of dislike) is not commonly taken to be a sign of consent or approbation? And to meet with what follows in the same figure, I further query,

Q 11. *Whether if men command us to own all that they do in Worship, though their Command cannot bind us against Gods, nor make our presence a Profession that we obey them against God;* yet if we do that which is a received sign (not made so by the commands of men, but by custom and common reception, as words signifie our thoughts) of owning the evil they (or rather we with them seem to) do in VVorship, this is not against God? And whether God doth not bind us not to do so?

12. *Whether if men by command make our Presence a Profession that we obey them against God, and say that our presence doth to them signify that we obey them against God, we ought not openly to declare (if we be present) that we mean no such thing by our Presence? And publickly express our selves against that (in their VVorship) which is disobedience to God; or rather whether we had not better be absent?*

Many other Queries I might add, which I may, when I am satisfied in these.

## POSTSCRIPT.

VVHereas Mr. Baxter in Sect. 6. p. 36. of his *Catholic Communion doubly defended*, hath endeavoured to excuse and justify himself from the charge of injurious naming of Persons: I shall take leave (as far as concerns



Apologist for the before-defended-Ministers) to consider and animadvert upon some passages in it, offer my reasons why I judge he hath not sufficiently defended himself; much less made sufficient reparation for the injury he hath done to their memories: So that it will remain too clear that he himself is too faulty in this matter, a busy-body, and too much and needlessly concerns himself with the Dead, and yet more effectually (I hope) vindicate those Reverend Ministers (or some of them) from his defamatory and censorious Pen.

Two things I blame Mr. Baxter for, concerning these Ministers.

1. That they are represented by him as such as were not fit to Preach, or that it was not fit they should Preach as long as there could be Readers got to distribute to the people Common-Prayer and Homiles, and no doubt of it a jolly company, and number enough of such good Scholars (as we Country-people call them) that could read these Learned Books, might in those Ministers times have been procured, without draining the Universities.

2. That he represents them thus to the world without any necessity, and this when they are dead and unable to defend themselves. Now how doth Mr. Baxter quit himself of this charge? Why as to the first and main, he denies it in his Double Defence, and says he is *much mistaken*, p. 39. beg. *I find that some much mistake me, and think that all the persons that I have named, I mention as inellectible (so you do I think still, as long as there are any Worshipful Readers to be found) or make them worse than they are (yes, I think so still, for I hope they are (at least) most of them in heaven, where they are neither worse nor bad, but very good; but waving the impropriety of the speech, for in this Separation-Controversy all things are present with the Divine Mr. Baxter, I think you represent them to us as if they were worse then indeed they were) and equal the better with the worse, (poor I, I have nothing to say to you as to that) yea make the Welsh-Itinerants worse than ignorant vicious meer Readers. (Not I, I say not that you make them worse in Morals, but that you make them worse in Doctrinals, worse in the Pulpit, and so liable to be kept out of it then meer Readers.) I do yet with submission humbly conceive All this as far from my words and thoughts.* Whether it be far from your thoughts, I cannot tell; but because you say so, I know not how (methinks) to disbelieve it: That they were far from your then present words and thoughts, when you wrote these very words, I cannot but take the word and believe it: but if much of this (as I understand it) was far from your thoughts, when you wrote the 28 page of your former Book against Dr. Owen, & the lower part of this page, and if you are still of the same mind, your thoughts and your words seem not to me to be near enough, but to keep at too great a distance from each other: but the *present thoughts* of very eminent men, may be very different (I perceive) from their former and their following; and it is not impossible, I understand, for men of singular Parts and Learning, and extraordinary Piety sometimes to mistake themselves, and therefore it is the less wonder if they happen also to mistake others. That you did make the *Welsh-Itinerants* worse, that is, more unfit to Preach than the meer Readers to voice it in the Church, and so represent them to the world as more insufficient then they for publick Church-work, will (I doubt) too plainly appear, if you seriously review and self-denyingly consider what they have written: And so your very Humble Servant, Mr. Baxter. With your leave I will now (as in civility I ought) turn to my Reader, and speak to him concerning you, but so loud that you may (if you please) hear all I say.

He

Now good Reader, let us impartially consider Mr. *Baxters* 28 p. of his *Carbolic Communion defended*, and see whether we can possibly, without blotting or interlining, make it speak or understand it in a sense agreeable to his Profession in the foregoing page of his latter Book; for my part I profess sincerely, so fain would I have squeezed a more charitable, and a more justifiable sense out of that page, that I read, and read, and read it over, and over, and over, I know not how often, to find such a one, (so unwilling was I to believe ill of Mr. *Baxter*, that I would rather disbelieve mine own eyes) but it would not be, that which was written must be the sense. Let us however try again; but before we come to the main offensive lines, let us observe somewhat in our passages to them. In this 28. p. to this *Objection* *But in those times serious godliness much increased*: he answers, *But how? It was mainly by the excellent Preaching and Living of that Ministry whom these Separatists vilified, such as the Assembly-men, &c.* To which I reply, (1.) And did noble *Baxter* vilify some of them too as *Antinomians*? (2.) If he includes *Wales* in those Parts, wherein he grants serious godliness increased, and if he means by his *Separatists*, such as those *Welsh* Ministers he after mentions; under Mr. *Baxters* favour, it was not mainly, nor comparatively at all, by those Ministers he speaks of (I have nothing to say against, but highly honour such, yet I would not have some Ministers raised upon the ruins of others) but by those very Ministers whom Mr. *Baxter* vilifies as Separatists and Antinomians, and what not? And whereas he adds, *And by a middle sort of Peace-makers, who engaged in no Sect.* I am sure one of them whom he is pleased to stigmatize, viz. Mr. *Morgan Lloyd*, was just such a one, and I dare say, did within his sphere by his labour and by his life as much increase serious godliness as any he knew, unless we must except Mr. *Baxters* great self; he goes on to add the effects of the separating party, but doth not at all prove that they were so; his fourth effect is, *Separated Churches of Anabaptists, kept up a religious war in many places*; but Mr. *Baxter* knows that Mr. *Tombs* was the King-leader of them, and he was not for Separation. His fifth effect is, *That all the Parish-Ministers in Wales were put down*; but this (to speak plain, though not so plain as I might) is not true, and it very much unbecomes him thus positively to scatter his untruths; if one should deal with him as he did formerly with Mr. *Begbom*, I fear this page would furnish our margin with too many Untruths. He adds, *Ignorant Preachers being set up in their stead, least the Parishes should be thought to be Churches*; and are the Parishes (without any other consideration) Churches? Or would Mr. *Baxter* have them so? I had thought Mr. *Baxters* principles had been somewhat more strict, and how doth Mr. *Baxter* prove that therefore *Itinerant Preachers were set up*? But now we are drawing near the main charge, he goes on, Perhaps you'll say, *These Itinerants were better than the old ignorant Ministers*: To which he answer two things, (1.) Their number was too Small. (2.) The chief of them were so erroneous in doctrine, that it was safer Meer Readers should Supply the Pulpit with their School-boy ministerial talent of Reading, then they should preach: These are not his words indeed, but I dare refer it to any one whether this be not most evidently the design and substance of the rest of this page of his; for it cannot be thought that so great a Divine, so great a Casuist as the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, one so tender of his own, and consequently of others reputation, as he hath been, and no doubt of it, still in his judgment is of others too seem prodigal of his own; that such a one should rip up the faults of the Dead without considerable reasons, and what should that be?

what can be more likely, more probable, more proper in this place, then to prove that the effects of separation were worse then putting off people with reading of forms, by making it appear, that where the former were, in many places men *lived like Atheists*, without any publick worship, and where there was any preaching, it was so erroneous, so corrupt, so dangerous, that reading of prayers and good books would have been far better, and therefore such readers would have been fitter in such places then such preachers, and consequently such preachers ( at least while such reading might be had ) were not fit to preach at all. Tho I confess I do not see what need Mr. Baxter had to prove the mischiefs of separation by Instances dragged out of the grave, and pulled down out of heaven, no more then Dr. Stillingfleet, who was more civil to the Dead : But further to prove Mr. Baxter guilty of what he denies, let us descend to the bottom of this 28th. page, where he craves a *sober Answer to this, ( 1 ) Whether a Liturgy had not been better then no Worship for Six days in seven ?*

For an Answer to which, and to what he before blunders about Peoples *Living like Atheists*, for want of publick Worship, I refer the Reader to. and I beg of thee to read Mr. Vavasor Powels *Short Narrative, or Narration of Wales Condition*, in the beginning of his Book, called, *The Bird in the Cage chirping* : And if thou readest it, I doubt not but thou wilt blush for Mr. Baxter, when thou findest there such another, such a quite different Account of the State of *Wales*, from what he is pleased here in too much haste, and with too little Consideration, to entertain us with; unless thou thinkest Mr. Baxter a more competent Judge of the Affairs of *Wales*, then Mr. Powel, who was most conversant therein; which if thou dost, thou canst not choose but chalk up thy self for a most unreasonable and idolatrous *Baxterian*; or if this like thee not, it will be too troublesome to read the Narrative; take a small House, a *Welsh Titt*, (if thou canst get him) and ride to the Mountains of *Brittain*, and ask some indifferent Person, (for some such there are in those cold Quarters, for all their *Welsh* Blood and Heat.) whether Mr. Baxter saith right, and whether they were such rude savage Heathens in the late times, and whether their Souls were not as well provided for then, as they are now, when there are Readers and Liturgies good store ? And when thou comest back, I dare say, thou wilt not idolize Mr. Baxter as an infallible Historian, at least not in the Transactions of *Wales*. The next Question he craves a *sober Answer to, is, Whether these Itinerants, that so dangerously erred in Doctrine, were not more sadly destitute of the help of the Spirit, then they that only wanted Ability to utter sound Words without a Form or Books ? And had not good Forms been safer for that People then the Doctrine of Mr. Erbury, Mr. Cradock, Vavasor Powel, Morgan Lloyd of Wrexham ?* The last had like to have escaped his lash, for in the former part of this correcting page, he was forgot, but now he is thought of. in he must too, not a Mothers Son shall be spared. Before I speak to this main Question, what I chiefly design, I crave leave to add to his Question these nine or ten Questions.

- ( 1. ) Whether every Error in Doctrine makes a man unfit to be a Preacher ?
- ( 2. ) Whether if a man be erroneous in Doctrine, so he do not preach his Errors, he may not for all that very lawfully be a Preacher ?
- ( 3. ) Whether Mr. Baxter proves that these men preached their Errors, supposing they did so dangerously Err as he would have them ?
- ( 4. ) How dangerously must a Preacher err in Doctrine, before he is to give place to Readers ?
- ( 5. ) Whe-

(5.) Whether every one that Mr. *Baxter* saith dangerously errs in Doctrine, (every one that differs from him) doth so indeed?

(6.) Whether because many of the Church of *England*, such as Dr. *Tuly* was, and many Dissenters, judge Mr. *Baxter* very dangerously to err in the Doctrine of Justification (*Articulis stantibus & cadentibus Ecclesiae*) he ought therefore to give place to meer Readers, or the Bishops do well to Compel him to do so?

(7.) Whether the Fathers, such as *Syuesius*, who erred concerning the Resurrection, and *Origine* who (its probable) erred concerning the State of the Soul after Death, and in many other things, and several others of them that had their Errors were of Mr. *Baxter's* mind in this matter, or whether the Church in their times were so? Or whether indeed they ought to have been degraded, and ceased to preach, and given place to meer Readers, who had at least the Scriptures then to read?

(8.) Whether it becomes Mr. *Baxter*, who sometimes busleth mightily for preaching and Preachers, to make such a huge pother for meer Readers, as if he would give them the preference to Preachers (especially if he doth but give them a bad name, such as *Antinomians*, and say they err dangerously) when as he cannot but know that it is no easy matter to prove that Christ appointed any such Officers in his Church, as meer public Readers; when there can be no great doubt that he placed Preachers, and those fallible too, there; and when the holy Spirit, and the holy Scriptures seem to make the Preaching of the Word even by fallible men, and when so, more honourable, and more necessary then the bare reading even of the Word it self; and I humbly propose it to the impartial and observing Readers of the Fathers and Church History, whether (though I know there were Lectors betimes) there was any such thing in the publick Worship of God amongst the Primitive Christians in some Ages, as meer reading? And whether any Lectors were then sent or ordered any where only to read, without some to Preach with them? I think I can make it appear very probable by some Passages in St. *Basil*, St. *Augustine*, and *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, that even in their time what was read by Lectors, was Preached or Expounded upon afterwards by the Bishop or Pastor, and did not they (think) want Preachers as much as *Wales* did in the late times? All this I propose with Submission.

(9.) I would gladly know who or where these blessed Readers are, or were, that only wanted Ability to utter sound Words without a Form or Books, that is, want nothing else?

(10.) Whether Mr. *Baxter* was not too sadly destitute of the Spirit, when he is villified, calumniated, and aspersed the Dead that live with God? But to his Question, directly, I answer these two things;

(1.) That if in their Preaching and Praying, they did not mingle their Errors, supposing them, or the Truth were predominant over the Error, there were much Truth and little Error, I humbly conceive they were not so destitute of the Spirit, as meer Readers, who have no help of the Spirit in their publick reading, as such, but what is common to Children and School-boys; and as for the inward Exercise of their own Graces, those are no publick Helps or Gifts, which in these Controversies we are ordinarily to understand by those Words.

(2.) The blessing of God upon their Labours doth much answer the Question, the great Success of their Ministry makes it appear that they were not so destitute of the Spirit, as they whom Mr. *Baxter* makes their Competitors, and is a probable

Argument that they did not so dangerously err as Mr. *Baxter* says; But where are the Converts of your meer Readers? What mighty Blessing hath attended the Lessons of the bare Liturgick Lectors? And what Wonders have been done in the Hearts and upon the lives of men, by the reading only of Prayers and Homilies? Which I do no more mention in Contempt, then Mr. *Baxter* contemns and undervalues the very effectual Preaching of Eminent Ministers, in Comparison with them, for I like very well many Homilies, and (for my own part) am not against the reading of them where there is a true and absolute necessity, but when they are raised up to equal, much more to juggle out the great Ordinance of Preaching (tho' it be the foolishness of Preaching) I think they deserve a lower place. But what becomes of these ten Questions, and these two Answers, it cannot but be most plain to the most partial Reader, by this Question of Mr. *Baxters*, that he makes these *Welsh Itinerants* worse for the publick Worship, and more unfit to officiate in it then meer Readers, that is, not fit at all, while these latter may be had; for if the Readers had more of the Spirit then they, and they were sadly destitute of his help, and it was not safe for them to preach, while it was safe and safer for the others to read; who but Mr. *Baxter* can doubt that he represents them as worse in this respect then meer Readers, and altogether unfit to preach, while such worshipful Officers might have been obtained? Nor doth Mr. *Baxter* at all mend the matter, in his last Book, after he had denyed what I charge him with, he makes it more plain that I take his Sence right in his former, for he says, *I assert, that sound Doctrine read out of Notes or Books, is less hurtful to the Hearers, then dangerous practical Error, delivered with fluent Extempore Fervency.* What can be more evident then that I have not mistaken him; he doth not here indeed apply it to the Itinerants, there was no need, for he had done it enough before; I leave it therefore to him ( who is most able and most fit ) to reconcile R. to B. as Roger the *Honest* hath very wittily and learnedly *Observed*. He doth indeed, a few lines before this last quoted Passage, seem to smooth up the business, and make three of the Itinerants some small amends, for having dragged them out of the Grave, he bobs into each of their Mouths a Sugar-plumb, but it is bitter within; he says, (having mentioned Mr. *Erbury* and others, without any good at all of them,) *I think much better of Mr. Saltmarsh, &c. and yes better of Mr. Powel, Gadock, Lloyd; gooder and gooder, as the Welshman said; and yet all is bad enough still; for all this they were not as good as Readers, nor good enough to Preach: And what Commendation of a man were it to say of him, I like him better than the Devil, or better than those men that have no good in them? However, those Ministers Friends are really obliged to him for thus much; for it is more than was allowed before, and a little of Mr. *Baxters* Charity must go far towards the *Welsh* Itinerants, and they must needs make as much as they can of a little; but before Mr. *Baxter* hath done with the *Welshmen*, he must have t'other stroak at Mr. *Lloyd* (for so with his wonderful Civility doth this disdainful man, without any Respect at all, haul in this Minister) and refers us to two Books wherein to fish for his Errors. The former, (viz. *A Dialogue, &c. about the Soul*) I have formerly read, but remember no Errors in it, nor any thing but what an ingenious Reader will easily bear with, in so abstruse a Subject as that of the State of separate Souls is: and I dare undertake to bring Notions every jot as uncouth, and seemingly harsh and unusual, out of almost any Author that hath writ of any thing, on the other side time, and*

Catholick Communion doubly Defended, p. 39. towards the bottom.



this Life, even out of Mr. *Baxters Dying Thoughts*, as any that can be culled out of that Dialogue; but must no body vent odd and unreceived Notions, but our Reverend Author? Hath he a Patent for it? And if any can extract dangerous Errors, whereby he was rendred unfit to preach, out of Mr. *Lloyds* two or three short Letters to Mr. *Erbury*, I will say this for him, he is a most subtle polemical Alchymist. Their cheif design is, to propose to Mr. *Erbury* some Questions (Orthodox Questions enough) and to Expostulate with him about the change of his mind and practice, wherein Mr. *Lloyd* sufficiently (tho' in a way of love, as his manner was) expresseth his dislike, of his new Espoused Ways and Notions; but there being no more yet said against these Ministers, I shall not at this time add any more for them.

As to Mr. *Baxter's unnecessary* traducing the Dead, having said so much already, I will only add, that it seems somewhat a strange and miraculous way of managing Controversies, to raise the Dead into the quarrel, especially when there is no great Occasion, and they themselves are to be thump, and wounded, and slain, which will appear, if we consider how absurd it would be, if all others would follow Mr. *Baxters* Example, and take up this new Mode of Controverting: Suppose the question to be disputed, were between the Calvinist and the Arminian, whether Calvinism or Arminianism are the best and most Orthodox ways; both the new-fashioned Disputants fall to it, argue against each other, *ab effectis*, from the ill Effects of the ways they oppose, presently draw a Circle and cast Figures, and then with a company of hard words, *Barbara, Celarent, Darji, Ferio, Cesare, Camestres, Festin, Baroco, Darapti, Felapton, Disamis, Datisi, Bocardo, Ferison*, they conjure the Dead, and one says, There is such a man was an Arminian, a vile Sinner was he; the other saith, And there is such a one was a Calvinist, what a wicked Wretch dyed he! One saith, Thy Father was an Arminian, and what a Covetous Miser was he? And th'other claps his hands and replies, And thy Grandfather was a Calvinist, and what a Drunkard was he? And so they go on disputing like mad; For *Aristotles* sake, what can this come to? To *Billings-gate* no doubt of it, nay and further too, without Prevention: Nay but speak seriously, what do you think the Conclusion of these Arguments will be? Why the Conclusion must needs be that they will raise up the Devil as well as the Dead. What Mr. *Baxter* urgeth and urgeth in defence of himself, for thus rebuking Dr. *Owen* and these men, that *Paul* reprov'd *Peter*, seems not to me over significant here, for *Paul* reprov'd him to his face, not behind his back; and while he was alive, not when dead and beyond Answering; and it is very considerable, that tho' God doth sometimes record the faults of his Children, yet at other times (which Mr. *Baxter* p. 37. of his *Doubly Defended*, observes, but (I fear) too reflectingly upon God, for which reason I will not repeat his words) he passeth them over with silence, to teach us perhaps that tho' he may divulge when he pleaseth, yet we should not be too forward to make our Remarques upon the Infirmitie of deceased Servants; nor can I see what Mr. *Baxters* accusing the *Welsh Itinerants* of Preaching dangerous Doctrine, could signify, to the Defence of the Truth, or the saving of the Church from the Danger of their Sophistry, unless he had answered their Arguments for their supposed Errors; nor can he well plead that their names gave reputation to their dangerous Doctrines, for as they did not own any such Demonstration as he gives them, so neither did most of the people of *Wales* dream that they were of any such, or did hold such dangerous Doctrines, till now he is pleased to tell them. In this I somewhat except Mr. *Erbury*, and a little Mr. *Craddock*, and in order to bring their Posterity to Repentance, a plain, mild Christian Demonstration.



that they were as guilty as he makes them, might do something, but aspersing and branding them with ignominious names, and rendering them more insufficient then Readers, can do nothing that way, nor hath any tendency to it.

And thus I have made it ( I believe ) too plain, that this Reverend and Learned Person hath (however it comes about) traduced the Dead, and that unnecessarily too; I have abundantly justified my charge against him, and sufficiently ( I hope ) Apologized for them, and enough likewise vindicated them from his needless and unworthy Reflections; much more ( I confess ) might have been said, both by way of Character, and in Defence of them, and more I design, which yet I think best to reserve for a further Occasion. The first Sheet may serve for a *Winding-Sheet* in order to their Re-burial; as also with this last (and whatever is more) as a *Cere-cloth* to Embalm and keep them sweet, and that I doubt not but it will; at least till Mr. Baxter is at Leisure, and hath a mind again to *blow* upon them, which ( I believe ) for his own sake, and for Religions sake, he will at length find he had better forbear, but if he must be at it again, he shall find me prepared ( I fear not ) to receive him.

In the mean time, (if there were any need) I would advise those men, and British Christians that knew, that were converted to, or confirmed in the Faith by, and consequently (as they ought) admired, these Reverend Ministers, that they would with (or without) Mr. Baxters leave, still do so, according to their usually successful Labours, and very great Abilities, but by no means think any better of those Errors which Mr. Baxter chargeth them with. And in the *Interim* too, once more I ye down, ye Blessed Saints, and rest quiet in your Graves and Heaven, and let your Memories (perfumed with the Odour of your names,) do so too, as without doubt they will, unless the Reverend and Learned Mr. Baxter shall out of his great Zeal against Separation, be pleased by his rude and uncivil Pen, to dig you up again. And now if a contemptible *Extreamed Opposer*, (for so must I expect to be *Extreamed*) may be so bold, I would humbly intreat Mr. Baxter (not to retract, for alas, I must not aspire so high, but) to lay to Heart what he hath done, and consider whether by his Censures of these Ministers, he will not be a means to promote those very Errors which he chargeth them with; for will not the many who yet survive, that have received great Benefit by their pious Labours, conclude, that if men so serious, so eminently holy and successful in their Ministerial Work, were of such a Denomination, and held such Notions, they are not sure so dangerous, especially since Mr. Baxter saith so, whose Tongue, and Pen, and Dispraise, are with some no Scandal, but rather a Recommendation? I justify not their Conclusion, but I think it be- seems not Mr. Baxter needlessly to become their Tempter, all my hopes are, that for this once they will not believe him.

To conclude, with all Submission I humbly desire him to look a little backward in his Life, and seriously to read two Passages, which I rather hope he will, because they are his own; The first is in his *Saints Rest*, p. 108. 11. Edit. There is no Recording of our Brethrens Infirmities, nor raking into the Sores that Christ dyed to heal. The second is nearer him, and liker, ( I suppose ) to his present thoughts, for it is in his *Dying Thoughts*, p. 329. It is a daily Grief and Shame in my Soul, to think of the Sins that I have committed, against some that are now in Heaven, which I either excused, extenuated or hid, and to think how much Evil they will know of me there, which on Earth they knew not by me. The Application is obvious, he who is so truly silent in applying his Doctrine to others, cannot

need by *help* effectually to apply it to himself; but whatever use he will make of that which I will, shall be to wonder that Mr. *Baxter*, who hath done so much in the justifying of those that for several Ages have been reckoned Hereticks, and so much excused, and so favourably interpreted the Jesuits and *Arminians*, should so severe upon these *Welsh* Ministers, as well as Dr. *Owen*; so severe as thus needlessly to Record their Infirmities, and rake into their supposed Sore; so severe to commit such Unkindness and Calumny against them who are now in Heaven, as he doth or will (as what is there but he can) excuse or extenuate it. I pray God it may be as really his Grief, as it is his Shame.

But me-thinks I hear some Reader say, Mr. Bookfeller, I pray who is the Author of this? Who is he? What is he? Why, and please you Sir, (for so we Count people able to speak) I will (to save Mr. Bookfeller the labour) tell you that the Author is in several Senses, *homo videtur nomen*, and is very well contented to be, and desires you would not disturb his privacy; censure as you please, only I let his name alone, for really it is not worth while to know it. But whoever he will tell you a little what he is; he hath been, and I assure thee is still (except before excepted) as great a Reverencer of Mr. Baxter, as any one that is not a dolator of him can be; one who hath run some hazzard by vindicating him, the Magistrates of no small Figure, and against Clergy-men that have reckoned themselves very considerable; and one who hath lost Friends and Interest among others, because reputed a *Baxterian*, and because he hath appeared for, and justified *Baxter*, when he hath (as he judged) without Reason, and uncharitably, been down and condemned; who is none of the highest sort of Separatists, but does some recede from love too far; who is heartily, and (if he mistakes not much of himself) practically for Moderation; who would be (if he had Abilities, and were any hopes of Success) a Reconciler of Christian, or rather Unchristian Controversies; who is also, or would be, as much for *Scriptural* (tho' not final) Liberty and forbearance amongst Protestants of different persuasions, as Mr. Baxter, who doth not measure out his love to others, by the agreeableness of their Tenets to his own, but by their real Piety; and endeavours to get more Truth and Light to walk according to what they have: And in a word, one who would not disturb the quiet of any one by these Sheets, much less of Mr. Baxter, had he been born to disquiet and asperse the Dead. And now having said all this, certainly it is a rash matter what the mans name is that gives me this trouble, and if thou dost believe this of him, is not it as probable, that if for the Bookfeller should be the name for his, thou wouldst not give credence to that neither? Therefore (good Reader) let this satisfy thee as to the Author; and if thou wouldst know more is in the Book, read it, if yet thou hast not (for some happen to *Hesitate* when they read with Books, and (as we read *Hebrew*) begin at the End, and end at the Beginning) read it (I say) and from first to last, and there you will find its design, and its

FINIS

need by help effectually to apply it to himself; but whatever use he will make of it, that which I will, shall be to wonder that Mr. Baxter, who hath done so much to the justifying of those that for several Ages have been reckoned Hereticks, and hath so much excused, and so favourably interpreted the Jesuites and Arminians, should be so severe upon these *Welsh* Ministers, as well as Dr. Owen; so severe as thus needlessly to Record their Infirmities, and rake into their supposed Sores; so severe as to commit such Unkindness and Calumny against them who are now in Heaven, however he doth or will (as what is there but he can) excuse or extenuate it. I pray God it may be as really his Grief, as it is his Shame.

But me-thinks I hear some Reader say, Mr. Bookseller, I pray who is the Author of this? Who is he? What is he? Why, and please you Sir, (for so we Country-people use to speak) I will (to save Mr. Bookseller the labour) tell you, that the Author is in several Senses, *homo nullius nominis*, and is very well contented so to be, and desires you would not disturb his privacy; censure as you please, only I pray let his name alone, for really it is not worth while to know it. But whoever he be, I will tell you a little what he is; he hath been, and I assure thee is still (excepting as before excepted) as great a Reverencer of Mr. Baxter, as any one that is not an idolater of him can be; one who hath run some hazzard by vindicating him before Magistrates of no small Figure, and against Clergy-men that have reckoned themselves very considerable; and one who hath lost Friends and Interest among Dissenters, because reputed a *Baxterian*, and because he hath appeared for, and justified Mr. Baxter, when he hath (as he judged) without Reason, and uncharitably, been run down and condemned; who is none of the highest sort of Separatists, but thinks some recede from love too far; who is heartily, and (if he mistakes not much in himself) practically for Moderation; who would be (if he had Abilities, and there were any hopes of Success) a Reconciler of Christian, or rather Unchristian Controversies: who is also, or would be, as much for *Scriptural* (tho' not sinful) Unity and forbearance amongst Protestants of different persuasions, as Mr. Baxter himself, who doth not measure out his love to others, by the agreeableness of their Tenets to his own, but by their real Piety; and endeavours to get more Truth and Light, and to walk according to what they have: And in a word, one who would not have disturbed the quiet of any one by these Sheets, much less of Mr. Baxter, had he been born to disquiet and asperse the Dead. And now having said all this, certainly it is a rush matter what the mans name is that gives me this trouble, and if thou dost not believe this of him, is not it as probable, that if I or the Bookseller should tell thee his name for his, thou wouldst not give credence to that neither? Therefore, I (good Reader) let this satisfy thee as to the Author; and if thou wouldst know more is in the Book, read it, if yet thou hast not (for some happen to *Hysteria* Print it with Books, and (as we read *Hebrew*) begin at the End, and end at the beginning, read it (I say) and from first to last, and there you will find its design, to satisfy and its

FINIS.

Printed  
the